


RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 07 2006

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**  
**UNDER 37 CFR §1.8**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted on the date indicated below via facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, facsimile number (571) 273-8300.

Date: March 7, 2006

  
Brooke French

In re application of: **Baggs**

Confirmation No.: **4858**

U.S. Application Number: **09/885,900**

Art Unit: **2878**

Filing Date: **June 20, 2001**

Examiner: **Yam, Stephen K.**

Our Reference Number: **10004919-1 (50818-1760)**

Title: **Space Saving Flatbed Scanner**

**Reply Brief**  
**Reply Brief Transmittal**

**Total Pages Transmitted (including cover sheet) - 5**

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 07 2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10004919-1IN THE  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICEInventor(s): **Baggs**  
Application No.: **09/886,900**  
Filing Date: **June 20, 2001**Confirmation No.: **4858**  
Examiner: **Yam, Stephen K.**  
Group Art Unit: **2878**Title: **Space Saving Flatbed Scanner**Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner For Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450TRANSMITTAL OF REPLY BRIEFTransmitted herewith is the Reply Brief with respect to the Examiner's Answer mailed on January 20, 2006.

This Reply Brief is being filed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.193(b) within two months of the date of the Examiner's Answer.

(Note: Extensions of time are not allowed under 37 CFR 1.136(a))

(Note: Failure to file a Reply Brief will result in dismissal of the Appeal as to the claims made subject to an expressly stated new ground rejection.)

No fee is required for filing of this Reply Brief.

If any fees are required please charge Deposit Account 08-2025.

- ☐ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Deposit:

OR

- ☒ I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571) 273-8300.  
Date of facsimile: **March 7, 2006**

Typed Name: **Brooke French**Signature: *Brooke French*

Respectfully submitted,

By *Daniel R. McClure*Daniel R. McClure  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)Reg No.: **38,962**  
Date: **March 7, 2006**  
Telephone: **(770) 933-9500**

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 07 2006


IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of: Confirmation No.: 4858  
Scott Baggs Group Art Unit: 2878  
Serial No.: 09/885,900 Examiner: Yam, Stephen K.  
Filed: June 20, 2001 Docket No. 10004919-1  
For: SPACE SAVING FLATBED SCANNER

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR §1.8

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted on the date indicated below via facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Technology Group 2100, facsimile number (571) 273-8300. Total number of pages in this transmission 5.

March 7, 2006  
Date

  
Brooke French

REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in reply to the Examiner's Answer, which was mailed January 20, 2006.

**Response to Examiner's Answer**

Applicants continue to disagree with the Examiner's positions as to all claims presently rejected. Applicants' Appeal Brief sets forth, from a substantive basis, the reasons why the cited art does not properly teach the features that are being claimed. The rejections set forth in the Examiner's Answer simply repeat (word for word) the prior positions taken by the Examiner in

the FINAL Office Action. Therefore, rather than restate or reiterate the rather lengthy bases and reasons why Applicants continue to disagree with the Examiner, Applicants repeat and re-allege herein the positions set forth in the Appeal Brief.

Simply stated, the Board should overturn all rejections due to fundamental misapplications of the cited art, as detailed in the Appeal Brief. In addition to the arguments in the Appeal Brief, Applicants briefly set forth the following additional comments for purposes of clarity.

Beginning on page 17 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner sets forth a "Response to Argument" discussion. This discussion is confusing, if not misleading, with respect to Applicant's arguments, so the undersigned provides the following clarification. For example, the Examiner's Answer states:

Thus, as seen in the rejection, it is evident that Examiner utilized Fig. 6 to describe the details of the flap 40 in relation to the channel, since Fig. 6 provides an enlarged view of the relationship between the flap 40 and components 10 and 21. Since the scanner configuration of the invention of Onoda is identical with respect to the prior art embodiment of Onoda with the exception of the details disclosed in Figs. 1-3, Examiner asserts that the usage of Fig. 6 to clarify a configuration which is applied to the inventive embodiments of Onoda is proper.


This portion of the Examiner's answer seems to imply that Applicants' argument relies only on the impropriety of applying the teachings of FIG. 6 with the different embodiment of FIGS 1-3. In fact, beginning on p. 6 of the Appeal Brief, Applicant addresses the entirety of the rejection. Applicants' discussion of the impropriety of mixing and matching components from the distinct embodiments was made to help illustrate one aspect of why the rejection was misplaced.

Simply stated, the Applicants and the Examiner have a fundamental disagreement as to the applicability of the cited art to the presently pending claims and the appropriateness of the

rejections set forth. For at least the reasons fully set forth in the Appeal Brief, Applicants respectfully submit that the Board should overturn the rejections of the Examiner.

No fees are believed to be due in connection with this Reply Brief. If, however, any additional fees are deemed to be payable, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fees to deposit account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel R. McClure  
Registration No. 38,962

(770) 933-9500